DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 192 RC 004 632

AUTHOR	Maynes, J. O. "Rocky", Jr.
TITLE	House Bill No. 1 Special English Classes: Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Arizona State Dept. of Public Instruction, Phoenix. Div. of Migrant Child Education.
PUB DATE	Sep 70
NOTE	44p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.30
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indians, Bilingual Education, Comprehension Development, *English (Second Language), Evaluation Methods, Language Skills, *Reading Programs, *Spanish Speaking, *Testing Programs, Test Results, Test Validity, Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS	*Arizona

ABSTRACT

As an evaluation report, this 1970 document summarizes information from 13 Arizona school districts involved in special English classes under House Bill No. 1. Program emphasis was on oral language development, vocabulary, and comprehension. Each district used its own method of evaluating progress; therefore, in synthesizing the information, each district is listed with a description of the evaluation instrument and the results of the pre- and post-tests. Total results from each district's evaluation showed progress in oral language development during the interim between pre- and post-tests. It is noted that, although progress was made in each program, many students fell below a level of language proficiency which would allow them success in a beginning reading instruction program. Tables of state and school district contributions and expenditures are included, as well as 5 recommendations. It is concluded that a significant contribution was made in oral English development for the Spanish and Indian children. The document is appended with pertinent information. (AN)

ED044192

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RECEIVED
OCT 5 1970
E.R.I.C.

HOUSE BILL NO. 1

SPECIAL ENGLISH CLASSES

Evaluation

Prepared and compiled by

J. O. "Rocky" Maynes, Jr.
Bilingual Specialist
Director, Migrant Child Education Division

for

W. P. Shofstall, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Arizona Department of Education

September, 1970

RC004632

18

ED044192

RECEIVED
OCT 5 1970
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Background and Up-to-date Information Regarding House Bill No. 1	4
Testing	5
Summary Report of Pre and Post-testing	6
Explanation of Tables 1 and 2	17
State Contributions: Table 1	18
School Districts Contributions: Table 2	20
Recommendations for Improvement of Program	22
Projected Enrollment in Program: Table 3	27
Summary	28
Appendix: Program endorsement letters from administrators and teachers	29

INTRODUCTION

The overall objective in the education of the bilingual child is his integration into the mainstream of American life. This does not mean that the bilingual child must give up his home language and his sub-culture, but rather that he be functional in both English and his home language. For the bilingual child to compete effectively whether in education, in a job, or in social situations, he must acquire the audio-lingual skills to the degree necessary for whatever role his abilities enable him to play.

Emphasis must be placed initially in the development of the audio-lingual skills (listening and speaking) of the bilingual child if he is to find success later in the skills of reading and writing. Nelson Brooks of Yale University brings out the importance of early audio-lingual learning and training in the following points:

1. Language competence on the part of the teacher and effective instructional materials are basic necessities. Equally significant is the manner of presentation to the learner.
2. Language is learned, systematic, symbolic vocal behavior; a culturally acquired, universal, and exclusive mark of man.
3. Words may refer to what is in the immediate environment of speaker and hearer, in reality or pictured. This is a use of words as signs. But words may also refer to what is not in the environment at all, except for what is in the minds of speaker and hearer. This is the use of words as symbols; it

is by far the commonest use that human beings make of language. This insight serves as a reminder that we must get beyond what can be seen and reacted to in the immediate environment before we enter upon the proper field of language symbolism. The importance of this for the early levels of language learning hardly needs to be stressed.

4. Different levels of meaning are to be found in terms and in propositions. This is why vocabulary must be learned in context, and the study of word lists, other than those made by the user himself, is a waste of time.

5. Language is a central feature of the complex of characteristic social patterns of belief and behavior which are referred to as a culture. The words of a language relate to the culture in which it is spoken, and without knowledge of that culture, the meaning of words can never be fully understood. (Reading readiness.)

6. Language behavior is not a matter of solving problems but of performing habits so well learned that they are automatic. In the formation of language habits the imitation of a good model is highly important.

7. The skills of hearing, speaking, reading, and writing are all involved in language behavior. In the audio-lingual phase language functions purely on its own. The visual-graphic phase is ancillary to language and important to it, but it can easily be foregone, as it is constantly in the daily life of everyone.

All four skills should be taught in a carefully prescribed sequence and proportion of allotted time.

8. Increment learning is particularly significant. One does not learn by making mistakes, but rather by giving the right response. If this can be given promptly and easily, with little or no waste in the form of wrong responses, learning is quicker and better.

9. Both analysis and analogy play important roles in the development of language behavior. More importance is given to analogy and less to analysis until a considerable body of language materials has been learned.

10. Every language has a grammar peculiar to itself, fully understandable only in terms of that language. There is a grammar of talk and a grammar of writing, and these differ at many points.

11. Language is what issues from the mouths of living speakers. Language on paper is a derived and secondary form of language.

12. A principal objective is to use the English language as it is used in American culture. Nevertheless, in order to establish semantic meaning at early levels, some use may be made of the child's home language.

House Bill No. 1
Special English Classes

Background and Up-to-date Information Regarding House Bill No. 1.

The consensus is that House Bill No. 1 with its one hundred thousand dollars ($100,00) to serve four thousand (4,000) non-English and limited English speaking children at twenty-five dollars ($25) per child was initially a step toward the right direction. However, now that the program is operational we are now aware of its limitations and the many needs that must be met.

Originally nineteen (19) school districts submitted proposals in which they identified five thousand one hundred fifty (5,150) children who needed a special English program. Of these 5,150 children we had to eliminate 1,150 due to the formula of funding at the rate of twenty-five ($25) per child. Even then, several of the nineteen schools could have identified and could have submitted several hundreds of children who need the special classes; but, the schools hesitated in sending in greater numbers being afraid of not being funded. Consequently, the LEAs sent in a smaller figure. Schools that fall in the above category would be Somerton, Wilson, Mesa, Douglas, and Nogales, just to mention a few. Then there are those LEAs that

felt that there wasn't enough money to go around who did not even submit a proposal. Schools that fall in this category are Glendale, Florence, Yuma, Tolleson, Littleton, and several of the schools in the northern part of the state and the Indian Reservations.

Testing: Identification, Pre-test and Post-test.

All 4,000 children in the special English classes were identified by means of a test as specified by House Bill No. 1 and the Guidelines as approved by the State Board of Education on August 25, 1969. Again all 4,000 children were pre-tested at the start of the program the last week in October and the first week in November, 1969. The post-test was scheduled for the week of April 22nd; and the results of both the pre and post-tests have been compiled into a report which follows.

SUMMARY REPORT

HOUSE BILL NO. 1

SPECIAL ENGLISH CLASSES

Summary of Evaluations

This report is designed to summarize information from school districts involved in Special English Classes under House Bill No. 1. Emphasis has been on oral language development, vocabulary, and comprehension. Each district used its own unique method of evaluating progress, and this report will attempt to synthesize that information in as simple and concise a way as possible and yet maintain the essence of the individual evaluations. The following tests were used by the various districts in assessing progress in oral language development:

1. Gates-McKellop Reading Diagnostic Test
2. California Achievement Test
3. Lee-Clark Reading Readiness Test
4. Monroe Oral Language Test
5. Metropolitan Reading Readiness
6. Iowa Test of Basic Skills
7. Van Alstyne Picture Vocabulary Test
8. ABC Inventory Test
9. Indiana Conference Scheme of Sentence Pattern Evaluation
10. Test of General Ability--Inter-American Series
11. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

The above list indicates a rather wide range with regard to kinds of tests used in assessment. Such procedure reduces the value and makes it difficult to interpret and

compare results. Some of the tests are not standardized so[7] there are no norms against which the progress of the children could be compared. The institution of a more consistant and appropriate kind of testing and reporting procedure would be of value in assessing the results of this program.

Evaluations and Results

Roosevelt School District No. 66

Instrument: Gates Reading Test, a basic test to measure vocabulary and comprehension.

Skills	Pretest 1-19-70		Post-test 4-19-70		Gain
	Grade	Month	Grade	Month	(months)
Vocabulary	1st	1	2nd	8	7.5
Comprehension	1st	8	2nd	7	8.7

The gain over the 3 month period from 1-19-70 to 4-19-70 was 7.5 months on vocabulary and 8.7 months on comprehension.

Dysert School District No. 89

Instrument: Lee Clark, California Achievement Test. These tests are used to measure growth in vocabulary and comprehension.

Pretest Fall 1969	Post-test Spring 1970
Median	Median
10th centile	40th centile

All percentile rankings were placed on a continuum and the median or middle score was determined as being representative of the progress of the group.

Nogales School District No. 1

Instrument: Metropolitan Readiness, a test evaluating proficiency in word meaning, listening, matching, alphabet, numbers, and copying all of which are important to success in school. The results of each of these areas are summarized into a total score.

Listed below is the mean or average score on the pre-test and the post-test:

Pretest Sept. 1969	Post-test April 1970
Mean	Mean
17th centile	48th centile

The pretest mean would fall in the Poor Risk catagory with regard to readiness. The post-test mean would fall in the Low Normal catagory or one catagory above where they began in September.

Tucson School District No. 1

Instrument: Metropolitan Readiness tests measure the child's ability in those areas found to be important to reading. The information is given in stanines one through 9 with one as the lowest level and 9 as the highest based on norm groups. As the youngsters progress, they move to higher stanines. The two areas measured were word recognition and reading.

Stanines	Word Recognition Pretest Sept. 1969	Word Recognition Post-test April 1970	Reading Pretest Sept. 1969	Reading Post-test April 1970
1	169	116	172	106
2	102	62	123	75
3	28	62	9	64
4	5	41	3	36
5	...	13	1	3
6	...	3	...	3
7	...	...	...	1
8	...	...	...	1
9	...	...	...	...

Progress over the interim period showed movement from the median in the first stanine to the median in the second stanine. Note the upward spread on the post-test.

Sunnyside School District No. 12

Instrument: Metropolitan Readiness and Stanford Achievement--Primary. Scores were plotted on the basis of stanines ranging from 1 to 9. The stanines were then combined and the average or mean score was calculated for the pre and post-tests.

Pretest October 1969	Post-test April 1970
Mean Score	Mean Score
2.19	4.26

This amounted to an increase of 2.07 stanines over the period between the pre and the post tests.

Whiteriver School District No. 20

Instrument: Metropolitan Readiness Test, a test evaluating proficiency in word meaning, listening, matching, alphabet, numbers, and copying, all of which are important to success in school. The results of each of these areas are summarized in a "total" score.

Listed below is the mean or average percentile on the pretest and the post-test:

Pretest Sept. 9, 1969	Post-test April 6, 1970
Mean	Mean
7th centile	51st centile

The pretest mean would fall in the Poor Risk catagory with regard to readiness. The post-test mean would fall in the Low Normal or one catagory above where they began in September.

Yuma County School District No. 21

Instruments: Lee-Clark Reading Readiness, Metropolitan Achievement, Iowa Test of Basic Skills, all of which were concerned with vocabulary and comprehension skills.

	Pretest Sept. 1969 (mean scores)		Post-test April 1970 (mean scores)	
	Grade	Months	Grade	Months
Vocabulary	1st	1.95	2nd	1.09
Reading	1st	7.30	2nd	.90

There was an increase of 8.1 months in vocabulary and 2.6 months in reading.

Avondale School District No. 44

Instrument: Monroe Oral Language Scale, an evaluation of syntax or sentence structure of oral language on a scale of from 1 through 5 beginning with one word responses at level 1 to complex sentences at level 5.

	Pretest November 1969		Post-test April 1970	
Levels	No. of students	Per-centage	No. of students	Per-centage
1	49	51	4	4
2	12	13	8	8
3	15	16	18	19
4	16	17	37	39
5	3	3	28	30

The median or average sentence complexity was at level 1 or the lowest catagory on the pretest and at level 4 or three catagories higher on the post-test. Monroe postulates that unless a child is functioning at level 3 or above he is not ready to begin a formal program of reading instruction.

Naco School District No. 23

Instrument: Monroe Scale, an evaluation of syntax or sentence structure of oral language on a scale of from 1 through 5 beginning with one word responses at level 1 to complex sentences at level 5.

Levels	Pretest October 1969 No. of students	Pretest October 1969 Per-centage	Post-test April 1970 No. of students	Post-test April 1970 Per-centage
1	15	28	1	2
2	11	38	9	32
3	3	10	7	25
4	0	..	11	39
5	0	..	0	..

Note that level 1 had 28% of the responses on the pretest and only 2% on the post-test, while level 4 had 0 on the pretest and 39% on the post-test indicating a significant increase in language sophistication and a general spreading and upward movement of all students.

Wilson School District No. 7

Instrument: Monroe Oral Language, an evaluation of syntax or sentence structure of oral language on a scale of from 1 through 5 beginning with one word responses at level 1 to more complex sentences at level 5.

Levels	Pretest September 1969 No. of students	Pretest September 1969 Per-centage	Post-test May 1970 No. of students	Post-test May 1970 Per-centage
1	23	21	2	2
2	55	50	11	11
3	31	28	31	32
4	1	1	27	28
5	0	..	25	27

Note that level 1 had 21% of the responses on the pretest and only 2% on the post-test, while level 4 had 1% on the pretest and 28% on the post-test indicating a significant increase in language sophistication and a general spreading and upward movement of all students.

Somerton School District No. 11

Instrument: Indiana Conference Scheme of Oral Language Analysis. This instrument uses oral language samples and analyzes them for syntax or sentence structure. As youngsters in the program become more proficient with the language, the kinds and frequency of sentence patterns will increase. Total words and partial sentences are also included in this evaluation.

	Total Words	No. of J partials[1]	No. of B sentences[2]	No. of A sentences[3]
Pretest October 1969...	914	318	33	3
Post-test April 1970.....	2093	264	160	10

[1]J partial sentences or incomplete, often one-word replies.

[2]B sentences were simple subject-verb-object replies.

[3]A sentences were simple subject-verb replies.

The increase in total vocabulary in the B sentences was the most significant aspect of the evaluation.

Douglas School District No. 27

Instrument: Indiana Conference Scheme of Oral Language Analysis. This instrument uses oral language samples and analyzes them for syntax or sentence structure. As youngsters in the program become more proficient with the language, the kinds and frequency of sentence patterns will increase. Total words and partial sentences were also included in this evaluation.

	Total Words	No. of J partials[1]	No. of B sentences[2]	No. of A sentences[3]
Pretest October 1969.....	1381	323	88	102
Post-test April 1970.....	2700	531	148	195

[1] J partial sentences or incomplete, often one-word replies.

[2] B sentences were simple subject-verb-object replies.

[3] A sentences were subject-verb replies.

The increase in total vocabulary and in B sentences was the most significant aspect of the evaluation.

Phoenix Elementary School District No. 1

Instrument: Monroe Oral Language Scale, an evaluation of syntax or sentence structure of oral language on a scale of from 1 through 5 beginning with one word responses at level 1 to complex sentences at level 5.

Grade	Pretest Fall 1969 (Levels)	Post-test Spring 1970 (Levels)	Gain
1	2	4	+2
2	3	4	+1
3	3	4	+1

It would appear that those near the mean and above are ready for beginning reading instruction.

Summary of Report

This report summarizes the results of oral language evaluations done in 13 districts involving approximately 3,600 children under House Bill No. 1, Special English Classes. This represents the majority of districts and over 90% of the children involved in the Special English program.

The kinds of tests used in evaluating progress in oral language development are numerous and varied making it difficult to interpret and compare results. Some of the tests have not been standardized so there are no norms against which the progress of the children can be compared. A more appropriate and consistant means of evaluating progress under this program would be desirable from the standpoint of analyzing results.

Total results from the evaluating done in each district showed progress in oral language development during the interim between the pre and post-tests. The range for individuals was from those who made no progress to those who made a marked and significant progress. It would be most

difficult and, perhaps, unwise to attempt to compare results between districts as the make-up of school populations vary. For instance, a youngster in South Phoenix may live in a much different linguistic and social environment than a youngster from the south side of Douglas, Arizona.

It should be noted that although progress has been made in each of the programs, that many of the youngsters are still below a level of proficiency in the language that would allow them success in a beginning program of reading instruction.

STATE CONTRIBUTIONS - Table 1

LOCAL SCHOOLS' CONTRIBUTIONS - Table 2

Table 1 shows the amount contributed by the State of Arizona to each participating school, the number of ADA Spanish or Indian speaking children by which each school was funded and who participated in the Special English Classes program, and how the funds were expended in implementing their individual programs.

Table 2 shows the contributions that each school claimed having made in order to further implement the Special English Classes program, a breakdown of their contributions by category, and other pertinent information.

Due to the many small allocations that were made to the schools, many schools had to utilize already hired staff members in order to continue the program. These tables, of course, do not show the pressures in regards to the hourly time that was placed on teachers and other staff members.

TABLE 1

School District	Amount of State Contribution	ADA Bilingual Students in Program	Personnel	Instructional Supplies	Instructional Materials or Other	Facilities	Capitol Outlay
Somerton Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 1	$2,584.60	106.745	-	$1,000.00	$1,584.60	-	-
Fort Thomas Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 7	$2,822.00	115.74	$1,300.00	$482.00	$1,000.00 Tests $40.00	-	-
Avondale Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 44	$2,882.08	115.283	$2,342.08	$540.00	-	-	-
Nogales Elem. Sch. Dist No. 1	$3,545.03	143.591	Aides $3,100.00	$200.00	$245.03	-	-
Mesa Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 4	$7,183.78	287.351	$6,300.00	$383.00	$200.00 Other $300.78	-	-
Whiteriver Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 20	$443.58	17.743	(Depends whether money is put in General Fund or a special fund)			-	-
Douglas Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 27	$3,560.70	142.428	$3,315.00	-	Other $245.70	-	-
Phoenix Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 1	$34,894.88	1,590.225	$18,587.76	$6,200.00	$1,700.00	-	-
Sunnyside Sch. Dist. No. 12	$1,605.68	64.227	-	$280.81	$1,300.57 Test $24.30	-	-
Dysart Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 89	$9,059.07	374.64	Tea.$5,600 Aide$1,960	-	$1,499.07	-	-
Wilson Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 7	$2,420.75	96.830	$1,420.75	$1,000.00	-	-	-
Tempe Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 3	$8,010.09	330.7355	←		NO REPORT		→

STATE CONTRIBUTION AND HOW EXPENDED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS (Cont'd.)

School District	Amount of State Contribution	ADA Bilingual Students in Program	Personnel	Instructional Supplies	Instructional Materials or Other	Facilities	Capitol Outlay
Tucson School Dist. No. 1	$13,865.98	554.639	$8,682.00	$5,183.98	-	-	-
Roosevelt Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 66	$737.50	29.5	$714.00	$23.50	-	-	-
Kyrene Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 28	$1,073.80	42.95	←		NO REPORT		→
Yuma County Sch. Dist. No. 27	$1,216.59	51.309	←		NO REPORT		→
Naco Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 23	$2,374.47	95.951	$500.00	$1,874.47	-	-	-
Gadsden Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 32	$1,719.42	74.5145	$700.00	$719.42	$300.00	-	-
TOTAL	$100,000.00	*4,234.4020					

* This figure does not include 558 students that were not provided for by the State.

SCHOOL DISTRICTS CONTRIBUTIONS AND BREAKDOWN OF EXPENDITURES

TABLE 2

School District	Amount of School Dist. Contribution	ADA Bilingual Students in Program	Personnel	Instructional Supplies	Instructional Materials	Facilities	Capitol Outlay
Somerton Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 1	$3,440.00	106.745	*$24,500.00	-	-	$2,000.00	$1,440.00
Fort Thomas Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 7	$1,050.00	115.74	$450.00	$150.00	$150.00	-	$300.00
Avondale Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 44	$2,326.02	115.283	$1,763.52	-	-	$562.50	-
Nogales Elem. Sch. Dist No. 1	$4,000.00	143.591	$1,000.00	$500.00	$500.00	-	$2,000.00
Mesa Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 4	$19,663.14	287.351	$16,914.00	$29.13	$220.01	$1,200.00	$1,300.00
Whiteriver Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 20	$6,821.48	17.743	$6,380.16	$35.19	$148.63	-	$257.50
Douglas Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 27	$16,400.00	142.428	*$61,988.30	$300.00	$200.00	7 rooms @2,000 ea.=$14,000.00	$1,900.00
Phoenix Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 1	$1,167.00	1,590.225	**	$191.00	-	$576.00	$400.00
Sunnyside Sch. Dist. No. 12	$5,078.00	64.227	$5,053.00	-	Test $25.00	-	-
Dysart Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 89	.00	374.64			NO REPORT		
Wilson Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 7	.00	96.830	The Wilson Dist. provided facilities, teacher, equipment, and materials in In-Kind investment.				
Tempe Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 3	.00	330.7355			NO REPORT		

* These amounts are not included due to the fact that these teachers were not hired part. for this program.
** 90 Teachers ½ hr daily) Dec. 8-May 22) 6600 hours by
50 Teachers ½ hr 3 days/wk) 110 days or) 140 teachers
) 22 weeks)

SCHOOL DISTRICTS CONTRIBUTIONS AND BREAKDOWN OF EXPENDITURES (cont'd)

School District	Amount of School Dist. Contribution	ADA Bilingual Students in Program	Personnel	Instructional Supplies	Instructional Materials	Facilities	Capitol Outlay
Tucson School Dist. No. 1	$5,800.00	554.639	-	$500.00	$500.00	$3,300.00	$1,500.00
Roosevelt Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 66	$164.00	29.5	Aide $102.00	$62.00	District owned materials.	One room daily-early a.m.late p.m.	-
Kyrene Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 28	.00	42.95			NO REPORT		
Yuma County Sch. Dist. No. 27	.00	51.309			NO REPORT		
Naco Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 23	$1,900.00	95.951	-	$1,000.00	$200.00	-	$700.00
Gadsden Elem. Sch. Dist. No. 32	$2,119.00	74.5145	-	$1,000.00	$500.00	-	$619.00
TOTAL	$69,928.64	* 4,234.4020	$31,662.68	$3,767.32	$2,443.64	$21,638.50	$10,416.50

* This figure does not include 558 students that were not provided for by the State.

Recommendations To Improve House Bill No. 1 - Special English Classes:

1. Raise the twenty-five dollars ($25) per child funding to a minimum of seventy-five ($75) per child.

   a. At the present time, if a school identifies 30 children for this program the school would receive seven hundred fifty dollars ($750) which means that the school could not even hire a bilingual aide. If this same school was to receive seventy-five dollars ($75) per child, the school would be able to hire a bilingual aide at the going rate of sixty dollars ($60) per week for 36 weeks. The aide would be under the direction of a certified teacher if the funding were placed at the recommended seventy-five dollars ($75) per child.

      Schools that identify 60 or more children, who need to be in a special English class, could then hire a full-time bilingual teacher. Even then the school would have to demonstrate some local effort and concern financially.

2. Eliminate the ruling that a child can participate in the special English classes only one year. This should be raised to three years.

   a. There are many children, particularly those that have recently arrived from Mexico to make their home in this country and those children who live in border

towns like Douglas, Naco, Nogales, San Luis and Somerton, who may need to be in the special English classes two or three years. Once a child gains the English proficiency level needed to function in the regular school program he would then be removed from this program whether it is after one, two or three years; and he would be placed entirely in the regular school program.

Up to this point in our special English classes throughout the state we are finding that there are students that should continue in this program for at least another year. However, we will have a better idea of the number who will need at least one more year toward the end of the school year when we post-test them.

b. How many children are currently involved in the Special English Class Program?

3,870	Spanish surnamed
130	Indian
4,000	

If the program were extended to two years the following would be an estimate of the number of children who could participate.

6,440	Spanish surnamed
3,093	Indian
9,533	

If the program were extended to three years the following would be an estimate of the number of children who could participate.

9,660	Spanish surnamed
4,640	Indian
14,300	

3. Delete "writing" from House Bill No. 1, section 2, paragraph B, lines 14-18, page 1 which reads as follows:

> In the first three grades of any common school district where there are pupils who have difficulty in writing, speaking or understanding the English language because they are from an environment wherein another language is spoken primarily or exclusively, the district may provide special programs of bilingual instruction to the extent deemed necessary to improve or accelerate the comprehension and speech of the English language by such pupils.

The reason for the deletion of the word "writing" is that it is not consistant with the emphasis stressed in the bill "to improve or accelerate the comprehension and speech of the English language by such pupils." A second reason for the deletion of the word "writing" would be that the greatest majority of first graders cannot perform the skill of writing which consequently would qualify all bilingual first graders in the state. The duty of teaching reading and writing becomes the responsibility of the regular language arts program.

4. That the appropriation of one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) be raised to an amount that will permit any

school district to establish a special English class, if the need exists. This would mean, estimating conservatively, that at seventy-five dollars ($75) per child one million seventy-seven thousand five hundred dollars ($1,077,500) would be needed.. If the per child funding remains at twenty-five dollars ($25) per child then three hundred fifty-nine thousand one hundred sixty-seven dollars ($359,167) would be needed.

a. By sampling schools that we felt had a high concentration of Mexican American children and by asking the school administrators if their schools were willing to participate in the state special English classes, we came up with the nine thousand six hundred sixty (9,660) number of children figure. Just based on this figure and the twenty-five dollars ($25) per child we would need over two hundred forty-one thousand five hundred dollars ($241,500)--this does not include the 4,640 Indian children who also need this type of program. (See Table 3, page 27)

5. It is highly recommended that monies be available to hire a full-time bilingual consultant who will help develop special English classes and who will help monitor the total state program. Job Description:

   a. To provide services to all school districts, especially the small ones, in drafting and developing programs

which will meet the oral English needs of the "bilingual child."

b. To provide assistance in the identification of areas of greatest need for these special English programs that will be set up.

c. To provide a constant, year-round service to school districts that have special English classes and to monitor such programs.

d. To report to the Legislature and to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction the progress of such programs by placing the responsibility of supervision of the program under this new office.

TABLE 3

School name.	Number of children being served.	Amount of money received by those districts that were funded.	Number of children who need special oral English training and could be served.	Amt. needed @ $25 per child	Amt. needed @ $75 per child
Phoenix Elementary School District #1	1,590.225	$34,894.88	1,648	$ 41,200	$123,600
Tucson District #1, Pima County -	554.639	13,865.98	1,171	29,275	87,825
Dysart Elementary School District #89	374.64	9,059.07	408	10,200	30,600
Mesa Public School District	287.351	7,183.78	700	17,500	52,500
Tempe Elementary School District #3	330.7355	8,010.09	350	8,750	26,250
Douglas Elementary District #27	142.428	3,560.70	275	6,875	20,625
Nogales Elementary #1	143.591	3,545.03	459	11,475	34,425
Avondale School District #44	115.283	2,882.08	150	3,750	11,250
Fort Thomas Elementary District #7	115.74	2,822.00	122	3,050	9,150
Somerton School District #1	106.745	2,584.60	301	7,525	22,575
Wilson School District #7	96.830	2,420.75	498	12,450	37,350
Naco Elementary School District #23	95.951	2,374.47	94	2,350	7,050
Sunnyside Schools	64.227	1,605.68	225	5,625	16,875
Gadsden Elementary School District #32	74.5145	1,719.42	72	1,800	5,400
Yuma County School District #27	51.309	1,216.59	46	1,150	3,450
Kyrene Elementary School District #28	42.95	1,073.80	143	3,575	10,725
Roosevelt School District #66	29.5	737.50	450	11,250	33,750
Bisbee School District #2	--		45	1,125	3,375
Whiteriver Elementary School District #20	17.743	443.58	400	10,000	30,000
Glendale Elementary	--		338	8,450	25,350
Buckeye Elementary	--		18	450	1,350
Tolleson Elementary	--		302	7,550	22,650
Superior Elementary	--		25	625	1,875
Littleton Elementary	--		194	4,850	14,550
Florence Elementary	--		100	2,500	7,500
Flagstaff Elementary	--		275	6,875	20,625
Chandler Elementary	--		450	11,250	33,750
Clifton District #3	--		45	1,125	3,375
Williams Elementary	--		102	2,550	7,650
Holbrook Elementary	--		220	5,500	16,500
Winslow Elementary	--		15	375	1,125
Miami Elementary	--		4	100	300
Globe Elementary	--		5	125	375
Eloy Elementary	--		10	250	750
Johnson-O'Malley Schools (Indian Children)	--		4,640	116,000	348,000
	Total *4,234.4020	$100,000.00	14,300*	$357,500	1,072,500

4,104.4020	Spanish surnamed	9,660	Spanish
130.	Indian	4,640	Indian
*4,234.4020		14,300*	

SUMMARY

It appears that House Bill No. 1, Special English Classes, even though it was only operational for six months, made a significant contribution to oral English development for Spanish-surnamed and Indian children in Arizona. This being the main objective of the program, it would warrant further efforts in not only continuing the program but in expanding it. This expansion could be done in one of two ways:

1. The funding for schools could be raised from the $25 per allocation to $75 or $100 per child. In this way the schools could better meet their responsibilities of meeting the oral English needs of the bilingual child by providing the bilingual personnel, instructional materials and instructional supplies needed.
2. Another way could be that instead of providing X number of dollars per child, the state would allocate schools' funds based on program development. Each school would submit a project which would be reviewed by the Arizona Department of Education and approved on its merits. However, there is one shortcoming to the program developing system, and that is that unless the Legislature appropriates more than the $200,000 as they did for 1970-71, districts like Tucson No. 1 and Phoenix Elementary No. 1 could very easily utilize the total appropriations, leaving dozens of small districts without a program.

Nevertheless, House Bill No. 1, Special English Classes gave the bilingual child a vital tool and experience in the development of this very necessary skill, oral English.

Dysart Public Schools
Route 1, Box 710
Peoria, Arizona 85345

September 1, 1970

Mr. J. O. "Rocky" Maynes
Director Migrant Child Education
State Department of Public Instruction
1333 West Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85013

Dear Mr. Maynes:

We are happy to report to you that through the bilinqual program sponsored by the State of Arizona last school year we were able to help 419 children. These children were given special training in oral language development each day.

Through subjective teacher evaluation definite improvement was noted in most of the children. Our program received $9059.07, of which approximately $5600 went to pay two teachers, $1960 paid for two aides, and approximately $1499 paid for instructional materials which were used by these instructors to further the language development of these children.

We are looking forward to another fine year under this program.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Stapley

Richard D. Stapley
Federal Programs Director
Dysart Public Schools

RDS/mb

ROOSEVELT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 66

John

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
ELMER JESTILA, PRESIDENT
RUTH C. WELCH, CLERK
G. BENJAMIN BROOKS
DR. HAROLD E. FREEMAN
REV. BERNARD BLACK

DISTRICT OFFICE
6000 S. 7TH STREET
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85040
276-7311

SUPERINTENDENT
T.G. BARR

ASSOC. SUPERINTENDENT
DR. O.L. BUCHANAN

May 26, 1970

Mr. J. O. Maynes
Division of Migrant Education
State Department of Public Instruction
1333 W. Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85013

Dear Mr. Maynes:

In our telephone conversation of a couple weeks ago, I told you of Roosevelt School District's continued interest in the bi-lingual education program.

We have been very pleased with the results of our initial program activities and want to make every effort to identify funds for the expansion of our project. Could you please send me all pertinent information and application procedures for the bi-lingual education program?

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Reno

Thomas R. Reno
Administrative Assistant

es

BOARD OF EDUCATION
MR. BEN F. WILLIAMS, JR.
President
MR. LOUIS AREVALO
Vice President
DR. MICHAEL GOMEZ
Clerk
MR. EDWARD PAGE
Member
MR. EUGENE CONTRERAS
Member

DOUGLAS SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER 27
POST OFFICE BOX 1237
DOUGLAS, ARIZONA 85607

MR. RONALD JENKIN
Superintendent
MR. JERRY McEUEN
Asst. Supt.
MR. DAVID RABAGO
Business Manager

April 29, 1970

Mr. J.O. Maynes, Jr.
State Bilingual Specialist
State Capitol Building
Phoenix,Arizona

Dear Mr. Maynes:

Enclosed please find a copy of the pre-test and post-test statistical data involving our Bilingual Program in Douglas.

We certainly appreciate all the help your office has given the Douglas Schools this past year.

We used the House Bill No. I allocation to staff additional aides for the teachers. This has been helpful to all teachers involved by freeing them from menial tasks to really do some teaching.

Sincerely,

Jerry McEuen

Jerry McEuen
Assistant Superintendent

JMcE/os

Enc.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
President
ADAM DIAZ
Clerk
MARIAN W. ARMER
Members
EARL H. CARROLL
GLENN STANLEY
G. SWISS THEILKAS

Superintendent
RALPH GOITIA
Administrative Assistant
MRS. FRA WEINACKER
Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services
KENNETH WALKER
Assistant Superintendent for Business Affairs
JAMES L. HEATH

PHOENIX ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1 MARICOPA COUNTY
125 EAST LINCOLN STREET PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
Adm. 258-2641

May 8, 1970

J. O. "Rocky" Maynes, Jr.
Director, Migrant Child Education
State Foreign Lanugage Supervisor
State Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear "Rocky",

Enclosed are the bilingual data (test results) for District #1. We gave a pre-test and a post-test for the "Inter American Series" and also using the Monroe Scale.

We believe the program in this District was highly successful as indicated by the test results and also based upon the subjective evaluations of principals, teachers, and all concerned.

I hope the legislature sees fit to fund this program again at a higher level so that more children from backgrounds wherein a foreign language is spoken can be included.

Sincerely,

Lew S. Griffith
General Curriculum Consultant

LSG:og
Enclosure:

May 19, 1970

J. O. "Rocky" Maynes
Director of Migrant Child Education
1333 West Camelback Rd.
Phoenix, Arizona 85013

Dear Maynes:

Enclosed are lists of students and pre-test and post-test information of those enrolled in Dysart's Bi-lingual, "Lucky Learner" program.

It is hoped that we may be in this program during the school year 1970-71.

Many thanks to you and your department for all the assistance in the past.

I Remain Sincerly,

R. E. Pomeroy
Dysart Public Schools
Rt. 1, Box 710
Peoria, Arizona 85345

KYRENE SCHOOL DISTRICT 28

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
R. F. "Bill" Hall, President
Ruben V. Hernandez, Clerk
Richard E. Evans, Member
Bill M. Owens, Member
Martin D. Kempton, Member

ROUTE 2, BOX 490
TEMPE, ARIZONA 85281

SUPERINTENDENT
C. I. Waggoner

DIRECTOR OF
INSTRUCTION
Joseph W. Taber

August 14, 1970

Mr. J. O. "Rocky" Mayres, Jr.
Director, Migrant Child Education
State of Arizona
Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Phoenix, Arizona

Dear Mr. Mayres:

Enclosed for your information are the test results for our 1969-70 Bilingual Education Program.

These results were compiled by the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory of Albuquerque, New Mexico. Included is a histogram of the matched students in our first grades (Valdes and Lucero) for the vocabulary, pronunciation,structure, and total portions of the SWCEL Test of Oral English Production. Perhaps, the most notable singular item is to look at the third variable in each group indicating a gain in structure from 70.85 to 102.3. An analysis of variance from pre- to post-test scores on the four variables shows that all four produced a significant difference at the .01 level. This indicates a significant gain. The analysis of variance independent variable one is pre-test, and independent variable two is post-test score.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph W. Taber

Joseph W. Taber
Director of Instruction

mo

encl.

SUNNYSIDE SCHOOLS

DISTRICT NO. 12
COORDINATOR OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND COMMUNICATIONS
470 EAST VALENCIA ROAD TUCSON, ARIZONA 85706
TELEPHONE 294-1411
AREA CODE 602

May 5, 1970

J.O. "Rocky" Maynes, Jr., Director
State Foreign Language Supervisor
1333 W. Camelback Road, Suite 215
Phoenix, Arizona 85013

Dear Mr. Maynes:

Enclosed are copies of the pre and post testing results of the Sunnyside District Oral English Program, and report of the expenditures of funds received under House Bill I, Special English Classes.

We hope these statistics help your cause with the legislature.

Sincerely,

Glenn R. Maurer.

Glenn R. Maurer
Coordinator of Federal Programs

Enclosures:
GRM/mj

C.J. JORGENSEN SCHOOL

ROOSEVELT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 66
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
PHOEBE K. SLAUGHTER, PRESIDENT
ELMER JESTILA, CLERK
RUTH C. WELCH
REV. GEORGE BROOKS
DR. HAROLD E. FREEMAN

1701 W. ROESER ROAD
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85041
PHONE: 276-7311

SUPERINTENDENT
T.G. BARR

ASS'T. SUPERINTENDENT
DR. O.L. BUCHANAN

PRINCIPAL
N.M. DOTY

June 1, 1970

Mr. J.O. "Rocky" Maynes
State Department of Education
Phoenix, Arizona

Re: Bilingual Class at Jorgensen School

The skills and tools for Spanish limit ones ability to learn English in a precise way.

First, in speaking Spanish you end words in only 10 ways. All words end in a,e,i,o,u,l,n,r,s or a silent d. The English language has about 40 ways to end words. This means that there are three out of four sounds that the spanish speaking child is not accustomed to hearing at the end of a word. In other words in his system of listening he is cued to hear only 10 endings. If we use a word that doesn't have one of these cues, he is not going to hear it, he is not going to say it and he is certainly going to have a difficult time reading it.

Take a simple sentence like - - "I don't want to" as he would say it. He hears Idowanto because he can't hear the words ending in t. He is able to hear the t in to because it ends in u, a sound which he has been cued to. We have to get this child to understand why there are 4 words representing this one sound he hears. Unless the teacher knows what causes the problem, that is the child's biggest problem - the fact that the instructor does not recognize the source of his trouble.

Other problems encountered are the s plus some consonant blends. There are none in Spanish. These produce a great deal of static. It's like shutting off one's voice as one goes along because it simply doesn't register. The child says "Its a big worl. The teacher hears"It's a big world." He says "I raise my han", and she hears "I raised my hand. S at the beginning of a word is a sound the child cannot hear. He says "escool", espace", "estop". He can begin these words with an e, but can't with an s, and if the teacher says the word quickly, he cannot hear it.

The ch sound is not explosive. It is not the same as our ch sound in chair or church. The spanish sound is between a ch and sh, and this is the sound he uses and it comes out shair or shursh. This is a very difficult sound for him to master.

Vowels present much difficulty. The child will say "keek the ball" instead of kick. He will say "pancil", instead of pencil. He has to learn to differentiate and discriminate between the various vowel sounds as in Spanish there is only one sound for each vowel.

One of the oldest teaching oxioms there is is to find out where the child is and start there. If he is not in English we must start in Spanish.

In conducting the bilingual classes I have worked with small groups for 30 minutes each day. I have stressed phonics and word attack as I have felt this is the root of the problem. With the older child we worked with word meanings. I used basal reading materials the children had not had contact with before. I tried to use experience charts whenever I had an opportunity. Several times we simply sat and conversed and practiced saying words that gave them difficulty such as breakfast - asked, etc.

I believe very strongly that these children I only worked with for half a year need more help. Some were just beginning to get a foothold when we had to stop. Learning language can't be done in a short time. We need the time for practice and use. I think the bilingual program should be carried on throughout the grades wherever there is the need.

Mrs. Narcy Tapia
Bilingual Instructor
Jorgensen School

TO: Skiff Primary Teachers
FROM: Lidia Ruiz
RE: Special English Program

The purpose of this program has been to teach and extend Oral English Language Development to the students involved.

The program is funded under House Bill No. 1 which is Arizona's Bilingual Bill. We were funded for 100 student participants in the primary grades. Since the present Bill allows for only one year participation by students in grades 1, 2, and 3, we started screening third year students first because this was the last year that they would be eligible for the program. The Monroe Test was selected as the instrument to be used for pre and post testing.

Our proposal called for a bilingual aide to work under the direction of a certificated person in implementing the program. It also called for students to participate in small groups on a daily basis. With your fine cooperation, this has all been accomplished, except that our full schedule allowed for only three ½ hour sessions in one week for each group.

Following are some of the Oral Language activities which have been included in the program:

Peabody Language Development Kits I & II — which constituted the main part of the program and gave it continuity.

Creating Stories.
Instructo Activity Kit.
The Listen-Hear Program.
Language Motivating Experiences for Young Children.
Better Speech and Better Reading, and Paper Bag Puppets.
Flannel Board Stories, such as: Tortoise and Hare, Billy Goats Gruff, etc.
Role Playing -- using ideas from "Learning About Role Playing for Children and Teachers and Puppet Playmates which are child-sized characters.
Records, such as: Albums on Building Verbal Power, Lets' Say Poetry Together, Listening Time Stories, Singing Action Games, Fun With Speech.
Flash Cards and Games, such as: Group Sounding Game, Popper Cards and Picture Word Cards.
Resource books such as: "The Remediation of Learning Disabilities, A Handbook of Psychoeducational Resource Programs, using the sections on listening and verbal expression.

At this time, our test data on pre and post testing results needs to be submitted to the Arizona State Department of Edcuation. Along with this, I would like to have the following information from teachers whose students were involved in the Special English Program. It is essential that we have this data from you. Please feel free to express your opinions on these matters.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

1. What improvement in Oral English performance, if any, did you observe in your students who participated in this program?

2. Were any students, in your observation, negatively affected by the program?

3. Do you prefer having students go to another classroom for the program or would you rather have the aide come to your classroom?

4. What suggestions do you have for improving the Special English Program?

5. Other Comments:

Teacher's Name _____
(you may leave this unsigned, if you prefer)

Please return to Lidia Ruiz by Monday, May 4. Thank you again!

HOUSE BILL I - SPECIAL ENGLISH PROGRAM
SKIFF SCHOOL
WILSON DISTRICT

The Special English Program at Skiff School, Wilson District, involved about 110 primary students. A bilingual aide worked with these students in small groups under the direction of a certificated person.

The Oral English Program was part of the curriculum for those students who participated. The growth that has taken place this year may, therefore, be attributed to the total curriculum implemented by each teacher as well as the Special English Program.

Third year students were screened first for the program since House Bill I limited a student's participation to one school year and this would be their last opportunity to be in this program.

The Monroe Oral Language Test has a 5-point scale used to indicate levels of language development:

Level 1 - Naming of Objects.
Level 2 - Describing action.
Level 3 - Indicating relationship between characters or objects.
Level 4 - Indicating time, place and cause-effect relationships.
Level 5 - Perceiving of mood and drawing conclusions or evaluating.

Monroe postulates that children who have not reached Step 3 or Step 4 have not developed sufficient language ability to interpret a picture in a primer and react to the text that accompanies the picture.

Skiff School students whose verbal responses were recorded and classified to be in Levels 1, 2, and 3 were included in this program.

The pre and post-test scores were obtained from the Monroe Oral Language Test.

Following are the questions and the teachers' comments:

Question 1:

What improvement in Oral English performance, if any, did you observe in your students who participated in this program?

Comments:

"The children seem to be more willing to participate in discussions and activities."

"I had two children participating in the OLP. One child had been speaking English only a year. She has improved in her oral communication considerably. She is not as shy as she previously was. She needs much more help and work to teach her to communicate better. However, I see much improvement this year -- largely attributed to OLP. The other child profited also, but not to such a noticeable extent. Eager to share experiences and verbalize."

"Not very much!"

"Most of pupils have overcome their self-consciousness when performing or leading the class in some kind of group activity. They are expressing themselves orally using words and terms within complete sentences that perhaps they previously would not have been able to do with ease."

"Self-expression improved. Talks and participates in class activities more."

"One child that rarely spoke does do more now. He is much more verbal."

"The children are expressing themselves more freely in writing. They seem to be using and knowing more words -- extended vocabularies. Some of them seem to be able to take questions, think about them and answer -- following the train of thought."

"An increase in conversation on a one to one basis."

Question 2:

Were any students, in your observation, negatively affected by the program?

Comments:

Six teachers commented "No."

"Some fell behind in math or English because their oral language took them out of the room while the others where finishing their work."

"Not to my knowledge."

"Some of them!"

Question 3:

Do you prefer having students go to another classroom for the program or would you rather have the aide come to your classroom?

Comments:

"I would prefer having them go to another classroom."

Four teachers commented, "Go to another classroom."

"Considering my current room organization, I prefer to have the children go to another room. There are not the facilities nor the room for the aide in my rooms."

"Go to another area or classroom."

"I prefer having the children go to another room for two reasons. One is that I don't feel having it in my room would give them enough freedom. Also, it's special to be in group # and be able to go someplace special."

"Neither!"

"I prefer that they go to another classroom."

Question 4:

What suggestions do you have for improving the Special English Program?

Comments:

"Take the children from one class at a time and not bother all the groups."

"Start with the first year students."

"Didn't watch it."

"It would be very beneficial to have the children meet every day."

"None -- Have not been able to observe these classes since I have my classes at the same time."

"The I.T.A. children should have the advantage of attending these classes."

Question 5:

Other comments:

"I don't know the children well enough to know if they have improved."
(new teacher)

"I feel most teachers do many of these things in their rooms -- so too much of them and the children lose interest."

"Once the aide became familiar with the children and the activities, the class went very well. Initially, it should be better organized."